



Charlotte Mason's House of Education,
Scale How, Ambleside, UK, 2009

The **Charlotte Mason Digital Collection** is a not-for-profit database created in 2009-2011 to assist scholars, researchers, educators and students to discover, use, and build upon the Charlotte Mason Collection of archives, journals and books housed in the Armitt Library & Museum (UK). To learn more about this database or to search the digital collection, go to [The Charlotte Mason Digital Collection](#).

Your use of images from the **Charlotte Mason Digital Collection** is subject to a [License](#). To publish images for commercial purposes, a license fee must be submitted and permission received prior to publication. To publish or present images for non-profit purposes, the owner, Redeemer University College, must be notified at cmdc@redeemer.ca and submission of a copy of the context in which it was used also must be submitted to the owner at cmdc@redeemer.ca. Credit lines, as specified in the [License](#), must accompany both the commercial and non-profit use of each image.

Unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal nor may you make multiple copies of any of the digital images. Higher resolution images are available. [Low resolution (150 dpi), single copy printing is permitted: High resolution images for publication can be purchased. Please contact Redeemer University College in writing as specified in the [License](#) to request high resolution images.

While the document originals are housed in the Armitt Library & Museum, Redeemer University College owns the rights to the Digital Images (in jpg/pdf format) of the original archival documents and artifacts. The original Digital Images and database metadata are owned and maintained by Redeemer University College. Multiple images are bound together in PDF Packages. Click [here](#) to download the latest version of Adobe Reader for better viewing. In the PDF, click an image thumbnail to view it.

This project was made possible through collaboration among the [Armitt Library & Museum](#) (Ambleside, UK), [Redeemer University College](#) (Ancaster, Canada) and the [University of Cumbria](#) (UK) and with the financial assistance of the [Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada](#).

Need help? If you do **not** see a side-bar with image thumbnails:

Some of the PDF packages are large and will take some time to download. A very large PDF package may open more successfully if you download it first to your desktop. (From inside the database record, right-click on the link to the PDF package and save the link to your desktop.) Once it's on your desktop, you can open it up with a recent version of [Adobe Reader](#).

If you have a Macintosh with Safari, the default program to open PDFs is Preview, which does not open the PDF packets. Mac users need to download [Adobe Reader](#). If this cover page appears without a list of PDF files (either at the side or bottom of the screen), look for a paper clip or a menu option to view attachments. If you click that, you should see a list of the pages in the PDF package.

Viewing files with Linux: This works with the default PDF viewer that comes pre-installed with Ubuntu. While viewing this cover page in the PDF viewer, click "View" on the top toolbar, and check the box that says "Side Panel". That will bring up the side panel. The side panel will show only this cover page. Click the 'arrow' at the top of the side panel, and it will give you the option to view "attachments." If you click that, you should see a list of PDF files, which are the pages in the PDF package.



chair. After a definition of education, which completely fell in with the line of thought advocated by the P.N.E.U., and an eloquent appeal to his audience not to treat a child's mind as a "turkey to be stuffed," or "a portmanteau to be packed," the lecturer dwelt shortly in some stirring words on "Prayer" and "Love." The address was interspersed with numerous anecdotes of animals to illustrate the desirability of a close and loving intimacy with and tenderness and consideration for "all things both great and small." Canon Wilberforce must have left on all his hearers an earnest wish that they might be able to train their children in such a manner that they too might know the joy of close friendships among the animal world such as he described. He concluded by calling down a blessing on the earnest work of the Union.—Particulars of the Cricket Club for women and children and the Natural History Excursions may be had from Mrs. Franklin.

HARROW.—A most interesting meeting of the above Branch was held in the Victoria Hall on May 10th, at 3 p.m., at which Miss Ravenhill, of the National Health Society, spoke on "Health in the Nursery and School-room." Mrs. Jerry Barrett in the chair. It is much to be regretted that there was such a small audience, for the lecture was an exceptionally good one, and one much needed at the present time. Five divisions of the subject were taken:—Matters relating to air, to water, suitable clothing, food and rest. *A propos* of water, Miss Ravenhill strongly recommended the Pasteur Chamberland Filter, though at the same time she said that water from a pure source, when it can be had, is always far better than any filtered water. As regards clothing, she was much in favour of woollen outside garments for children, and argued that had such always been used many a terrible accident from fire would have been avoided. Miss Ravenhill, of course, advocated plenty of undisturbed sleep, mentioning how strong an incentive to this was the evening warm bath. She specially urged its usefulness after the excitement of a children's party, when the bath is sometimes omitted with the idea of saving the child extra fatigue, but really with the effect of giving it less chance of quiet sleep. At the end of the lecture many questions were asked by members of the audience, who seemed one and all to be thoroughly interested in the subject.—There will be a lecture on June 21st by Miss Goodrich Freer, on "Women's Work as Horticulturists," which it is hoped will be well attended.

EDINBURGH.—On April 6th, the last meeting of the current session was held at 7, Heriot Row, by the kind invitation of Mrs. Greenfield. The Rev. John Kelman was the lecturer, and his subject, "The mind of the child and how to interest it." Mr. Kelman dealt particularly with the best ways of interesting children in religious teaching, different methods of making right ideas attractive and wrong ones unattractive. The audience was smaller than usual, which is accounted for by the fact that many members leave town at the beginning of April. The Rev. Robert Simpson was in the chair and led the interesting discussion which followed.

THE PARENTS' REVIEW

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE
OF HOME-TRAINING AND CULTURE.

"Education is an atmosphere, a discipline, a life."

P.N.E.U. CONFERENCE, 1898.

TUESDAY MORNING, May 10th.

AT PORTMAN ROOMS.

DR. SCHOFIELD, who took the chair, said that this was the Second Annual Conference, and that he had much pleasure in welcoming so large an audience. He then introduced MISS MASON, who read her first paper on

P.N.E.U. PSYCHOLOGY IN RELATION TO CURRENT THOUGHT.

MISS MASON: If the end of the eighteenth and the end of the nineteenth centuries have one feature in common more than another, it is, that in both education comes to the front as among the chief ends of man. The eighteenth century people had the best of it. They had clear oracles in their Locke and their Rousseau. They knew what they wanted to do and they did it with charming enthusiasm. The period teems with memoirs, and it is very pleasant to read about the philosophically and consistently brought up children of the more thoughtful families. They had convictions and they had the courage of their convictions. We are less happy. A quarter of a century ago we too were in a *furore* of joyous excitement about education. Educational "movements," schools, colleges, lectures, higher education for women, "public" day schools for girls, examination tests which should give assurance on every point,

were multiplied all over the country and all over the continent. It was a forward movement which has brought us incalculable gains; and not the least of these gains is the fact that to-day we are dissatisfied and depressed, and inclined to wonder whether we are not on the wrong tack. If educational work of the best kind had not been going on amongst us for the last two or three decades, we should not have arrived at this "divine discontent." All the same, it is pretty evident that the time has come when we must change our front. Now, Elementary Schools, now, Girls' High Schools, now, Public Schools, now, Women's Colleges, are pronounced to be, on the whole, "a failure." They do a great deal it is said, but is what they do worth doing? Is it, in fact, education? The bolder sceptics go so far as to attack our two ancient universities; but they, very likely, will weather the storm because of the very inertness, the "masterly inactivity" let us call it, which their opponents abuse; the universities do a great deal of "letting-alone."

Our pretty general dissatisfaction with education, as it is, is a wholesome symptom and probably means that sounder theory and happier practice are on their way to us. One thing we begin to see clearly, that the stream can rise no higher than its source, that sound theory must underlie successful work. We begin to suspect that we took up schemes and methods of education a little hastily, without considering what philosophy or, let us say, psychology, underlies those schemes and methods; now, we see that our results cannot be in advance of our principles. To-day the *psychologist* is abroad, as, twenty or thirty years ago, the *schoolmaster* was abroad.

But, alas, psychologies are many and educational denominations are bitterly opposed to one another. We must feel our way to some test by which we can discern a working psychology for our own age; for like all science, psychology is progressive. What worked even fifty years ago will not work to-day and what fulfils our needs to-day will not serve fifty years hence; there is no last word to be said upon education; it evolves with the evolution of the race. At the same time, that there should be at least half-a-dozen systems in the field, no one of them entirely satisfactory even to the persons who adopt it, shows that we, who practise education,

should at any rate attempt to show what are the requirements of a sound system of psychology.

That system of psychology which shall be of use to practical people in giving purpose, unity and continuity to education must satisfy the following demands:—It must be adequate, covering the whole nature of man and his relations with all that is other than himself. It must be necessary, that is, no other equally adequate psychology should present itself; and it must touch at all points the living thought of the age; that is, it must not be a by-issue to be discussed by specialists at their leisure, but the intelligent man in the street should feel its movement in step with the two or three great ideas by which the world is just now being educated.

Among the thoughts which the mysterious *Zeitgeist* is employing to bring us up, I think we may put first, *the sacredness of the person*. Every person is interesting to us to-day. The interviewer does more than satisfy vulgar curiosity; what he has to tell is equally welcome to us all whether he interviews the London "step-girl," the costermonger, the man of the book-barrow, 'Arry and 'Arriet out for a holiday, an ambassador, an author, an artist, a royal personage; every detail that will help us to realize the personality of one or other is more than welcome. So, too, of what is called the "Kailyard" literature; it rests on a sound basis. Literary merit it may or may not have, but it tells us what we want to know—every-day details about the people, any people, of any county, or of any country. Slang dictionaries, collections of folk-lore, big biographies which tell us minutely how a man dines and breakfasts, walks and sleeps, all is grist to our mill. We set an enormous and, I think, an increasing value upon *persons*, simply *per se*; and any system of psychology which is to appeal to us must bring the *person* to the fore. He may be influenced by this and that, but he, himself, the indefinable person, of whom we are sensible while he is yet in arms, and of whom we do not finally lose sight, however he be marred by vice and misery, must play for himself the game of life, and shape for himself those influences of environment, education, and what not, that do their part to make him what he is. A system of psychology which gives us man in this sort of relation to educational forces should become common property at once, because this

is what every mother of a family and teacher of a school, every sort of director of men and women, knows about.

Next we demand of education that it should *make for the evolution of the individual*; should not only put the person in the first place, but should have for its sole aim the making the very most of that person, intellectually, morally, physically. We do not desire any dead accretions of mere knowledge, or externals of mere accomplishment. We desire an education that shall be assimilated; shall become part and parcel of the person; and the psychology which shall show us how to educate our children in this vital way will meet our demands. The doctrine of evolution has brought about a greater *bouleversement* in philosophy than perhaps we are aware of, and we shall find by-and-by that "education" means nothing less than the evolution of the human being at all points; and that the acquisition of knowledge is not necessarily education at all.

One other idea that appears to be at work in the world for the elevation of mankind is that of *the solidarity of the race*. The American poet, Walt Whitman, expresses one side of this intuition when he tells us how *he* conquers with every triumphant general, bleeds with every wounded soldier, shares the spring morning and the king's highway and the pride of the horses with every jolly waggoner, in fact, lives in all other lives that touch him anywhere, even in imagination. This is something more than the brotherhood of man; that belongs to the present, but our sense of the oneness of humanity reaches into the remotest past, making us regard with tender reverence every relic of the antiquity of our own people or of any other; and with a sort of jubilant hope, every prognostic of science or philanthropy which appears to us to be the promise of the centuries to come. Is it too much to expect that psychology shall take cognisance of this great educational force as well as of the two others I have indicated? I do not say that these three are the only, so to speak, *motor* ideas of our age; but I think they are the three of which we are all most aware, and I think, too, that any system of psychology which takes no cognisance of either, or of all of them, does not afford that basis for our educational theory and practice of which we are in search.

Let us consider now some three or four of the psychologies which have the most widespread influence to-day. But we

do not presume to do this as critics, rather as inheritors of other men's labour, who take stock of our possessions in order that we may use them to the most advantage. For the best thought of any age is common thought; the men who write it down do but give expression to what is working in the minds of the rest. But we must bear in mind that truth advances like a country gate allowed to "swing to" after a push. Now it swings a long way to this side and now a long way to that, and at last after shorter and shorter oscillations the latch settles. The reformer, the investigator, works towards one aspect of truth, which is the whole truth to him, and which he advances out of line with the rest. The next reformer works at a tangent, apparently in opposition, but he is bringing up another front of truth. Then there is work for us, the people of average mind. We consider all sides, balance what has been done, and find truth, perhaps in the mean, perhaps as a side issue which did not make itself plain to original thinkers of either school. But we do not scorn the bridge that has borne us.

We need not go further back than Locke, who represents the traditional educational notions in the homes of the upper middle classes. People who bring up their children by "common sense," according to "the way of our family," do so more often than they know because their great, great grandfathers read Locke. He did not concern himself with the *mind*, or *soul*, of man, but with "*states of consciousness*." Ideas, images, were, for him, to be got only through the senses; and a man could know nothing but what he got hold of through his own senses and assimilated by his own understanding. As for choice and selection in these ideas and images, Locke gives a comprehensive counsel—"What it becomes a gentleman to know" is the proper subject-matter for education. The mind (*i.e.*, the man?) appears to have little colour or character of its own, but has certain powers and activities for the employment of the ideas it receives; and, to account for these, Locke invented the pestilent fallacy which has, perhaps, been more injurious than any other to the cause of education—the fallacy of the "faculties of the mind."

Now let us bring Locke up to the standard which we have erected, remembering always that our power to raise a higher

standard is due to him and such as he. There is no unity of an inspiring idea, no natural progress and continuity, no ennobling aim, in an education which stops at the knowledge a gentleman should acquire and the accomplishments a gentleman should possess. The *person* hardly appears except in the way of the semi-mechanical activities of his so-called faculties; he is practically the resultant of the images conveyed through his senses. The *evolution*, the expansion of the individual in the directions proper to him, has no place here; every man is shut tight, as it were, in his own skin, but is taught to behave himself becomingly within that limit. That intellectual commerce of ideas whereby the dead yet speak their living thoughts in the work they have left us, and by which as by links of an endless chain all men are bound to each and all men influence each, has no place in a philosophy which teaches that a man can know only through his own understanding working upon the images he receives through his senses. In so far as we wish to attain to the possibilities of the hour we must take farewell of Locke, though we do so with gratitude and even with affection.

The modern school, which regards psychology strictly as a "natural science," works more or less on the basis of Locke, plus an illuminating knowledge of biology. Here, as with Locke, the "mind" is apprehended only as "states of consciousness"; the senses are the sole avenues of knowledge, which reaches the brain in the form of ideas or images. But I shall represent this "rational psychology" best by citing a few sentences from Professor James (Harvard University), whose wise and temperate treatment of the subject commands the respect and attention of even those who differ from him. He opens with a limiting definition of psychology as the "*description and explanation of states of consciousness as such.*" He treats psychology as a "natural science." After bringing forward facts, familiar to most of us, shewing the intimate connection between acts of thought and the cerebral hemisphere, he says, "taking all such facts together the simple and radical conception dawns upon the mind that mental action may be uniformly and absolutely a function of brain action varying as the latter varies, and being to the brain action as effect to cause. This conception is the working hypothesis which underlies all the physiological-psychology of recent years."

This is not far removed from the announcement of the Frenchman that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile, both processes being purely material and mechanical, and doing away with any requirement for the profoundest thinking beyond that of a well-nourished brain. No wonder the author finds himself compelled to admit that to some readers "such an assumption will seem like the most unjustifiable *a priori* materialism." The discussion of "the self" might be supposed to present insuperable difficulties, but they are disposed of, and, says our author, "the logical conclusion seems to be that the *states of consciousness are all that psychology needs to do her work with. Metaphysics or theology may prove the soul to exist, but for psychology the hypothesis of such a substantial principle of unity is superfluous.*" That is to say, the important personage which I call *I, myself*, need be no more than perpetually shifting states of consciousness effected by the brain; and the sameness or identity of person, which seems at first sight the one bit of solid ground in a shifting morass, rests upon no more than the fact that the brain may be conscious of the same objects to-day that it was conscious of years ago!

But, after proving with great clearness and power through a considerable volume * that all the phenomena of intelligent life *may* have their sole source in the physical brain, Professor James concludes—"When, then, we talk of psychology as a natural science we must not assume that that means a sort of psychology that stands at last on solid ground. It means just the reverse; it means a psychology particularly fragile and into which the waters of metaphysical criticism leak at every joint, a psychology all of whose elementary assumptions and data must be reconsidered in wider connections and translated into other terms. It is, in short, a phrase of diffidence and not of arrogance, and it is indeed strange to hear people talk triumphantly of the 'New Psychology' and write 'Histories of Psychology' when into the real elements and forces, which the word covers, not the first glimpse of clear insight exists. A string of raw facts, a little gossip and wrangle about opinions, a little classification and generalisation on the mere descriptive level. . . . but not a single law. . . . not a single

* *Outlines of Psychology.*

proposition from which any consequence can causally be deduced." This is soothing, and we close Professor James' book* with satisfaction; but the pity of it is that all the "new" psychologists are not as modest as the Professor,—are, may we venture to say so, not a little arrogant: what is more, the student who goes carefully through this text-book of psychology is only too likely to consider that the author has proved his case—that psychology is a "natural science," "and it is," like Peter Bell's primrose, "nothing more"—up to the hilt, and he is not likely to go through a process of re-conversion at the last page.

It is dreary to suppose that one may not be anybody after all, but only a momentary state of consciousness. Hope goes out of life, for there is nothing pleasant to look forward to. If something agreeable should happen next year, there is no *I, myself*, to enjoy it; only the "state of consciousness" of some moment to come. Faith goes where all is fortuitous; when other people and ourselves are, so to speak, the circumstances of the moment; where there are no persons, there is no possibility of that divine afflatus which we call enthusiasm: for that recognition of another on a higher plane which we mean when we say we "believe in so-and-so," for that recognition of the divine Being which we call Faith. We become devitalised; life is flat and gray; we throw desperate, if dull, energy into the task of the hour because we shall so, any way, get rid of that hour; we are glad to be amused, but still more glad of the stimulus of feverish work; but the work like ourselves is devitalised, without living idea, without consecrating aim. Our manner becomes impassive, our speech caustic, our countenance dreary and impenetrable. This is the change that is passing over large numbers of the teaching profession, men and women of keen intelligence, who might well have been inspired by high ideals, quickened by noble enthusiasms, had they not imbibed an educational faith which meets all aspirations with a *cui bono?* We give what we have, and only what we have. What have these to pass on to the children under their care?

But we need not sit down under this blighting system of thought. It is *inadequate*, as the best of their own prophets—Mr. James, for example—freely allow; there is more in man

* *Outlines of Psychology.*

than this philosophy has ever dreamt of. It is *unnecessary*, for, as we shall presently see, more than one other psychology accounts with greater, though never with complete, success for the phenomena which a human being presents. It is *inharmonious* with the *movement of the age*.^{*} It effaces that personality which the age tends to exalt and magnify, and to regard with tender interest, under even sordid conditions. We should walk about, mechanical contrivances amongst other mechanical contrivances, and we could not expect one motor-car to find another motor-car interesting. The principle of *solidarity* is lost, and, of social and family life loosened; for what binding tie can there be between beings whose entity *may* be no more than a state of consciousness? Again the *evolution* of the individual is checked at the point of mechanical perfection. Good mathematicians, clear-headed scientists, may be turned out; but what place is there for the higher forces of humanity, aspiration, speculation, devotion? We have reason to keep watch at the place of the letting out of waters, that is, the psychology upon which our educational thought and action rest. There is delightful certitude in the results of anthropometrical research. You may predicate with certainty given facts about a child from the way in which he stretches out his arm. Most precious pathological work is being done, and many a child's hidden weakness is revealed and consequently brought under curative treatment by the exquisite tests which it is now possible to apply. The danger is that we should take a part for the whole and allow this "new psychology" to usurp the whole field of education.

DR. SCHOFIELD, who was obliged to leave early on account of a pressing engagement, thanked Miss Mason for reading the first part of her admirable paper. He maintained that theory must ever be beyond practice, and ideals beyond their realization if we are to grow as a society or as individuals. Thus with regard to truth, it was seldom to be found among combatants, but half way between two opposing camps. The effort to reconcile mind and matter was like trying to reconcile Armenians and Calvinists, or to connect two parallel lines. The "Christian Scientists" represent all matter as mind, but the only tenable position is to hold that no movement of mind takes place without a corresponding movement of matter, and that we have our brain, and also ourselves.

MRS STEINTHAL then took the chair, and MISS MASON continued her paper:—

It is refreshing to turn to that school of German educational thought which has produced the two great apostles, Pestalozzi and Froebel. What we may call the enthusiasm of childhood, joyous teaching, loving and lovable teachers and happy school hours for the little people, are among the general gains from this source. To look a gift-horse in the mouth is unworthy, and it would seem pure captiousness to detect any source of weakness in a psychology to which our indebtedness is so great. But no stream can rise higher than its source, and it is questionable whether the conception of children as cherished plants in a cultured garden has not in it an element of weakness. Are the children too carefully tended? Is nature too sedulously assisted? Is the environment too perfectly tempered? Is it conceivable that the rough-and-tumble of a nursery should lend itself more to the dignity and self-dependence of the *person* and to the evolution of individual character, than that delightful place, a child-garden? I suppose we have all noticed that children show more keen intelligence and more independent thought in home-play and home-talk than one expects of the angelic little beings one sees at school. I daresay most of us know Fra Angelico's picture of "The Last Judgment," one of the scenes in which gives us a circle of little monks (become as little children) dancing round, hand-in-hand, with gracious angels on their way to Paradise. The little monks are obviously very happy and very good; but somehow one misses the force of personality; they do not look as if they were capable of striking out a line for themselves; and this may be a danger in the Kindergarten. "Make children happy and they will be good," is absolutely true, but does it develop that strenuousness, the first condition of virtue, which comes of the contrary maxim—"be good and you will be happy"? Kindergarten teachers are doing beautiful work; but many of them are hampered by the original metaphor of the plant, which is exactly lacking in that element of personality, the cherishing and developing of which is a sacred and important part of education. The philosophic German mind beheld in man a part of the *Cosmos*, which, like the rest, needed only to be placed in fit conditions to

develop according to its nature. The weak point in the argument is that man would appear to fall under the laws of two universes, the material and the spiritual, and that to energise and resist and repel is a law of his being. It will be said that this need not apply to the child; that the struggle for existence may well begin after a happy childhood has been secured; but probably any sort of transition violates the principles of unity and continuity which should rule education. No doubt all thoughtful Kindergarten teachers recognise in what direction the limitations—all men have their limitations—of their Founder lay, and their practices are levelled up to modern thought. The general substitution of free brush-drawing, in which the children have some initiative, for the cramped pencil drawing in chequers of the old Kindergarten, is an illustration of the modern spirit; but it is well for us all to remember our origins and our tendencies that we may recognise and avoid our dangers.

I have only time to glance at one more "psychology," that which is, curiously enough, dividing the American mind with the school which regards psychology as a "natural science," and at which English teachers are beginning to snatch as a drowning man snatches at a straw. This is the psychology of Herbart, another German philosopher of the beginning of the century contemporary with both Pestalozzi and Froebel during the best years of his life. His theory of man is wide as the poles apart from either of those we have already considered; and there is no denying that it affords a tempting working basis for education. It is only when we come to examine the Herbartian psychology in connection with the two or three great thoughts upon which, as we have seen, the world is being educated, that it is found wanting. Herbart begins to account for man minus, what I have called, the *person*.* He allows a soul, but, he says, "the soul has no capacity nor faculty whatever either to receive or to produce anything. It has originally neither ideas nor feelings nor desires. It knows nothing of itself and nothing of other things. Further, within it lie no forms of intuition or thought, no laws of willing and acting, nor any sort of predisposition, however remote, to all this."† There remain

* "Person" is used in the common-sense, every-day acceptance of the word.

† *Herbartian Psychology*, by J. Adams, from Herbart's *Lehrbuch zur Psychologie*, Part iii., sec. 152, 153.

two possibilities for the soul; an effective *vis inertiae*, and, what Herbart describes as the power of reacting on an idea, that is to say, the soul itself is no longer quite as it was after it has thus reacted. The problem is simplified anyway. All our complex notions of intellect, will, feeling and so on, disappear. The soul is thrown open to ideas—a fair field and no favour—and ideas, each of them a living entity, according to the familiar Platonic notion, crowd and jostle one another for admission, and for the best places, and for the most important and valuable coalitions, once they have entered. They lie below the “threshold” watching a chance to slip in. They hurry to join their friends and allies upon admission, they “vault” and they “taper,” they form themselves into powerful “apperception masses” which occupy a more or less permanent place in the soul; and the soul—what does it do? It is not evident except that it affords a stage for this drama of ideas; and the self, the soul, or the *person*, however we choose to call him, is an effect and not a cause, a result, and not an original fact.

A philosopher who emphasizes the potency of ideas, does good work in the cause of education. We get glimpses of a perfect theory—how our function shall be to supply the child always with fit ideas, and with the best ideas; how we shall take care so to select and arrange these ideas that they shall naturally fly to one another and make strong “apperception masses” once they have got beyond the “threshold” in the child’s soul. A fascinating vista is open before us; education has all things made plain and easy for her use; she has nothing to do but to select her ideas and turn out a man to her mind. Here is a tempting scheme of unity and continuity! One might occupy all the classes in a school for a whole month upon all the ideas that combine in one “apperception mass” with the idea “book.” We might have object lessons on the colours, shapes, and sizes of books; more advanced object lessons on paper-making and book-binding; practical lessons in book-sewing and book-binding; lessons, according to the class, on the contents of books, from ABC and Little Bo-Peep to Philosophy and Poetry. A month! why a whole school education might be arranged in groups of ideas which should combine into one vast “apperception mass,” all clustering

about “book.” The sort of thing was done a year or two ago, here in London, apple being the idea round which the “apperception mass” gathered. If one is to find the principles of unity and continuity in the *ideas* presented to the soul, this is all good and well. But if, as we believe, these principles must emanate from the soul, or person, himself, this tempting unity may result in the collection of a mass of heterogeneous and unassimilated knowledge.

Again, given two souls supplied with precisely the same ideas, in precisely the same order, and with no other ideas whatsoever, and we get duplicates of the same person, a possibility which would demolish once and for ever that great conception, the *solidarity of the race*. Once more, what does the Herbartian theory of man minister to our interest in personality, our sense of the *sacredness of the person*? The person is *non est*, or is the mere sport of the ideas which take possession of him. He has not as much as a special fitness for one class of ideas rather than for another; all is casual; and, as for the *evolution of the individual*, it is not he, but this or that mass of ideas which possesses him, that expands. The man appears to be no more than a sort of vessel of transport to carry ideas into their proper sphere of action. Herbartian psychology is rich in suggestion, but we cannot take it up as it stands without losing the educational value of the two or three leading principles which are, as we say, “in the air” for the teaching of mankind.

I have now examined briefly the three or four psychologies which hold, more or less, the field of educational thought. We see that each *advances* truth, but that neither expresses the whole truth even so far as to afford a working basis for educators. So people either work on by rule of thumb, or they borrow a fragment here and a fragment there as the case appears to demand; like children with a hard sum whose answer they know, and who try now division, now multiplication, now subtraction, to make it come right. No doubt there are also many able psychologists who may not have written books, but who work out the problems of education, not with a view to the answer, but according to a code of inherent principles which they have discerned for themselves.

What have we of the Parents’ National Educational Union to bring forward in the way of a working psychology which

shall meet the demands I have indicated? We do not claim to be philosophers; we are modest and practical people looking out for a secure basis for education. It is just possible that bringing unbiassed minds and a few guiding principles to the task, we have, not joined the parts of the puzzle, but perceived dimly how an outline here and an outline there indicate, not so many separate psychologies, but shadowings forth of a coherent, living, educational principle destined to assume more and more clearness and fulness until it is revealed to us at last as the *educational gospel*, the discovery of which may be the destined reward and triumph of our age. Let us try to set forth, though with diffidence, what we have done, knowing that no man and no society can say of educational truth, "This is mine and that is thine," for all is common and none of us can know how much he gives and how much he takes.

For ten years we have worked definitely and consistently upon a psychology which appears to us fairly adequate, necessary, and in touch with the thought of our age. If we are asked to show our results, all we can say is that thousands of intelligent, educated people are bringing up their children more or less on what they call P.N.E.U. lines. These children, wherever we come across them, have certain qualities in common. They are curiously vitalised, not bored, not all alive in the playing-field and dull and inert in the schoolroom—even when it is that place, proverbial for dulness, a home schoolroom taught by a governess. There is unity in their lives; they are not two persons, one with their play-fellows and quite other with their teachers and elders; but frank, fresh, showing keen interest in whatever comes in their way. Then, too, there is continuity in their education. Little children are always eager to know; but the desire for knowledge seldom survives two or three years of school-life. But P.N.E.U. children begin on lines that go on from the first baby lessons, through boyhood, girlhood, womanhood, motherhood; there is no transition stage but simple, natural, living progress. I know only a comparatively small number of P.N.E.U. children, and the claims I venture to make for them must rest, not only on the evidence of the few, but on the principles upon which we work.

In the first place, we take children seriously as *persons* like

ourselves, only more so; the first question that comes before us is—what do we understand by a person? We believe the thinking, invisible soul and acting, visible body to be one in so intimate a union that—

"Nor Soul helps flesh more now than flesh helps Soul"

If the doctrine of the Resurrection had not been revealed to us, it would be a necessity, in however unimagined a form, to our conception of a person. The countenance of our friend with the thousand delicate changes which express every *nuance* of feeling; the refinement, purpose, perception, power, revealed in his hand, the dear familiar carriage, these are all inseparable from our conception of the person. Whatever is advanced by the physiologist and the rational psychologist as to the functions of that most marvellous brain cortex, the seat of consciousness as furnishing us with images and impulses, of the motor nerves as originating action, of the brain as the seat of habit; of the possibility of educating a child in all becoming habits of act, in all sweet habits of thought, by taking measures to secure that these habits become, as it were, a memory of the brain to be awakened by due stimuli,—all these things we believe and receive; and we believe further that the possibility of a rational education rests upon this physiological basis, only fully discovered to us within the present generation.

But then we believe the assumption that all this delicate mechanism is automatic to be gratuitous and inadequate; it is to be assumed that the *person* should possess such vehicle of expression and medium of relation to the outer world. For the rest, we believe that the *person* wills and thinks and feels; is always present though not always aware of himself; is without parts or faculties; whatever he does, *he* does, all of him, whether he take a walk or write a book. It is so much the habit to think of the person as a dual being, flesh and spirit, when he is, in truth, one, that it is necessary to clear out minds on this subject. If he is of the flesh, he is all of the flesh; if he is of the spirit, he is all of the spirit. The person is one and not several, and he is no more compact of ideas on the one hand than he is of nervous and muscular tissues on the other. That he requires nutriment of two kinds is no proof that he is two individuals. Pleasant and well-cooked food makes man of a cheerful countenance, and wine

gladdens the heart of man, and we all know the spiritual refreshment of a needed meal. On the other hand we all know the lack-lustre eye and pallid countenance of the well-fed who receive none of that other nutriment which we call ideas; quick and living thought is as necessary for the full and happy development of the body as it is for that of the soul. Holding this view, we believe that our educational doctrine is *adequate* because, while following the progress of biological psychology with avidity and making use of every gain that presents itself, and while following with equal care the advance of philosophic thought, we recognise that each of these sees the chameleon in a different light, that the person includes both and is more than both; and, if our educational creed is by no means conclusive, we think it is not narrow, because we have come across no problem of life or mind the solution of which is shut out from us by any dogma of ours. We cannot say that our P.N.E.U. doctrine is *necessary*, but we do say that some educational theory, which shall include the whole nature of man and the results of scientific research in the same or a greater degree, is necessary. We find ourselves, too, in touch with those three great ideas which seem to me to be the schoolmasters of the world at the present moment. The *person* of the child is sacred to us; we do not swamp his individuality in his intelligence, in his conscience or even in his soul; perhaps, one should add, to-day, or even in his physical development. The person is all these and more. We safeguard the initiative of the child and we realise that, in educational work, we must take a back seat; the teacher, even when the teacher is the parent, is not to be too much to the front. There is no more facile way of swamping character and individuality than by that idol of the "fifties"—*personal influence*.

We consider that, EDUCATION IS THE SCIENCE OF RELATIONS, or, more fully, that Education considers what relations are proper to a human being; and in what ways these several relations can best be established; that a human being comes into the world with capacity for many relations; and that we, for our part, have two chief concerns—first, to put him in the way of forming these relations by presenting the right idea at the right time and by forming the right habit upon the right idea; and, secondly, by not getting in the way and so preventing the

establishment of the very relations we seek to form. Half the teaching one hears and sees is more or less obtrusive. The oral lesson and the lecturer, with their accompanying notes, give very little scope for the establishment of relations with great minds and various minds. The child who learns his science from a text-book, though he go to Nature for illustrations, and he, who gets his information from object lessons, has no chance of forming relations with things as they are, because his kindly obtrusive teacher makes him believe that to know *about* things is the same thing as knowing them personally; though every child knows that to know about Prince Edward is by no means the same thing as knowing the baby-prince personally. We study in many ways the art of standing aside. People sometimes write that the books set in the *Parents' Review* School constitute much of its usefulness; they do not always see that the choice of books, which implies the play of various able minds directly on the mind of the child, is a great part of that education which consists in the establishment of relations. I have even known of teachers who have thought well to compose the songs and poems which their children use. Think of it! not even our poets are allowed to interpose between the poor child and the probably mediocre mind of the teacher. The art of standing aside, to let a child develop the relations proper to him, is the fine art of education, when the educator perceives the two things he *must* do and how to do these two things. The evolution of the individual is a natural sequence of the opening up of relations. How we labour towards *the solidarity of the race* I hope to show more fully to-morrow. But, for example, we do not endeavour to give children outlines of ancient history but to put them in living touch with a living contemporary thinker. We are not content that they should learn the history of their own country alone; some living idea of contemporaneous European history, anyway, we try to get in; that the history we teach may be the more living, we work in, *pari passu*, some of the literature of the period and some of the best historical novels and poems that treat of the period, and so on with other subjects.

There is nothing new in all this; what we venture to claim is that our work is unified and vitalised by a comprehensive theory of education and a sound basis of psychology.